

Date: Sat, 13 Aug 94 04:30:11 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #372
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 13 Aug 94 Volume 94 : Issue 372

Today's Topics:

Amateur Radio Beginner
In-Reply-To: CW ...IS history!

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 11 Aug 1994 00:45:05 -0400
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!nntp.ucsb.edu!ucsduxb.ucsb.edu!library.ucla.edu!agate!
spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!
mail-news-gateway@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Amateur Radio Beginner
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hi,

I just heard about Amatuer Radio from a friend who is also beginning to
learn about Amatuer Radio. It sounds really interesting to me and I would
like to learn more details about this. Are there any magazines and books
for Amateur radio? Or any FTP sites where I could download files
about Amatuer Radio?

I am interested in learning those codes and if you know where I can
register for the class, do let me know. I live in Columbus, Ohio.

Thanks very much! :)

Brenda

Date: 13 Aug 94 08:19:40 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: In-Reply-To: CW ...IS history!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>
> >4. The USCG ceased CW training in August 1993.
>
> You did! Who is running the code practice on 5870 KHz?
>

CW training was conducted at the Radioman 'A' School. If you're hearing code practice on 5870khz, please provide me the callsign of the originating station and I'll be happy to investigate. Are you certain it's code practice, or merely an automated weather product, which we still provide? It's entered as a file from a remote computer.

NMC = CAMSPAC San Francisco
NMO = Commsta Honolulu
NOJ = Commsta Kodiak
NMF = Commsta Boston (remotely keyed from NMN)
NMN = CAMSLANT Chesapeake
NMA = Commsta Miami (remotely keyed from NMN)
NMG = Commsta New Orleans

Date: 8 Aug 94 01:08:05 GMT
From: agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!paulf@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <080494231648Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<paulf.776111847@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>, <080694154930Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>
Subject : Re: CW ...IS history!

dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

>It is not, plain and simple. It can be used in time of war as such.

I think you need to go back and read what I wrote again. The USCG becomes part of DOD during a war. As such, they run by the same rules as any other part of DOD, and maintain a liason bureaucracy with DOD.

But if you're still into bandying semantics, and live within a few miles of a navigable seaway, I'll be more than happy to request that those "non-military"

high endurance cutters shell your house with those peaceful, "non-military"
five inch guns...;-)

--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington

Date: 10 Aug 94 22:59:56 -0500
From: nntp.ucsbs.edu!ucsbuxb.ucsbs.edu!library.ucla.edu!agate!
howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.duke.edu!eff!news.kei.com!
uhog.mit.edu!news.mtholyoke.edu!news.@@ihnp4.ucsds.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsds.edu

References <329ivd\$m3s@oak.oakland.edu>, <1994Aug10.095731.1@aspen.uml.edu>, <32arus\$8fj@oak.oakland.edu>og.
Subject : Re: Let's kick this idea around...

In article <32arus\$8fj@oak.oakland.edu>, prvalko@vela.acs.oakland.edu (prvalko) writes:

> martinja@aspen.uml.edu wrote:
> : What is more legitimate than it's illegal?

> Geez Jim, of course it's CURRENTLY illegal. That's why I brought it up
> as a CHANGE to the rules.

Oh [dumb look] yeah....that's right you sure did. <|D

> : So what is it about CB radio that you are proud you never were one?
>
> <sigh> more irrelevent bandwidth...
~~~~~

Who are you calling an elephant? <grin, grin>

> : consider myself pretty young as far as amateur radio goes.  
> : So, I am not one of those individuals who have had a license for 180  
> : some odd years [who is...ha?]  
>  
> I have to smile at this, as I read back about how you said you were a  
> CBer prior to 1973, inferring that CB was "better" before it got real  
> popular in the mid-seventies.

You are very perceptive...

> : that I hope never even makes it to the table for discussion.

> Hey Jim, you're too late, it IS on the table and we ARE discussing it!

You got me there Paul. But...I think you know whose table I meant. Anyway, I think I will probably get more flames for my reply than you will for your idea. This is a very interesting topic and does beat the heck out of the code/no-code thing. Of course after putting on the straw that breaks the camel's back...we just love to pile on more straw. Kinda like killing a dead horse, don't ya think?

I hope you can tell I'm just having fun with all this with just a tint of seriousness dropped in. I'll keep reading the replies to your original though. As Mr. Spock would say, "Fascinating." Simply fascinating.

73 de WK1V  
-jim-

-----  
Date: 11 Aug 1994 03:03:49 GMT  
From: nntp.ucsb.edu!ucsbuxb.ucsb.edu!library.ucla.edu!agate!  
howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.duke.edu!eff!news.kei.com!  
yeshua.marcam.com!zip.eecs.umich.edu!@ihnp4.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Aug9.182240.17073@mixcom.mixcom.com>, <EkEIkiubGoLS066yn@access.digex.net>, <1994Aug10.213624.7262@mixcom.mixcom.com>  
Subject : Re: Let's kick this idea around...

Well... I've gotten a ton of email and we've had some lively discussion here.

\*BUT\*

NOBODY has yet given one single objective reason why this proposal would not work, nor has anyone given an example of a likely method of abuse that was not covered by the HEAVY restrictions on the REMOTE operator, nor the fact that the LICENSED CONTROL OP was placing their license on the line anytime they did run a remote op.

73 =paul=

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #372

\*\*\*\*\*